

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 have been rejected.

Claim 2 was objected to.

Claims 1, 2 and 25 have been amended.

Claim 21 has been canceled.

Claims 1-20 and 22-25 are pending in this application.

Claim 2 was objected to because of an informality, which has been corrected in accordance with the Examiner's directions.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-19, 20-22 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverinen (US 7107620) in view of Kalavade (US 7239632). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include claim 21 (subsequently canceled) and to reflect that an extensible local network authentication message is used that includes at least one data element that is ignored by the local network but contains the GPRS authentication message. Support for this can be found in the specification on page 10 line 27 to page 11 line 4.

Haverinen fails to teach a combined authentication procedure, as admitted by the Examiner, and therefore could not have envisioned applicant's technique to use an extensible local network authentication message that includes at least one data element that is ignored by the local network but contains the GPRS authentication message to accomplish the combined authentication.

Kalavade teaches one authentication message encapsulated into another authentication message. However, Kalavade fails to teach the aspect of adding at least one data element that is ignored by the local network but contains the authentication message of another network to accomplish the combined authentication. Therefore, neither Haverinen nor Kalavade teach this element.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable and non-obvious over Haverinen in view of Kalavade.

Claim 25 has been amended similarly to claim 1 and is therefore deemed inventive as well, for the same reasons.

Further, claims 2-19, 20, 22 are dependent on amended claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, and are therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverinen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 2003/0119481 (Haverinen2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended into a condition for allowance as detailed above.

Claims 23 and 24 are dependent on amended claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, and are therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patently distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Salkintzis et al.

Customer Number 22917
Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196

By: /Brian Mancini/
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750